

Appln. No. 10/782,105  
Amendment dated December 1, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 1, 2005

### REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 through 11 remain in this application. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claim 12 has been added.

Claims 1 and 3 through 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Klinger.

Claims 1, 7, and 8 each require, in part, "said head member comprising a perimeter wall for selectively engaging the clip member, said perimeter wall having a first end and a second end said perimeter wall defining a substantially cylindrical bore extending through said head member from said first end to said second end for receiving the parking brake cable such that said perimeter wall is positioned around the parking brake cable" and "said head member comprising a first portion and a second portion, said first portion being coupled to said second portion for being inserted into the housing to depress clips of the clip member to release the clip member from the housing to allow the parking brake cable to be removed from the housing, each of said first portion and said second portion having a substantially cylindrical exterior surface, a diameter of the exterior surface of said first portion being greater than a diameter of the exterior surface of said second portion". Further, claims 1 and 7 each require "wherein said bore defined by said perimeter wall is uniform in width from the first end of said perimeter wall to the second end of said perimeter wall".

The Klinger reference teaches a quick connector universal release tool that fails to teach the first portion of the head member having a substantially cylindrical exterior surface with a diameter greater than a diameter of the substantially cylindrical exterior surface of the second portion to allow the second portion to be inserted into the housing as

Appln. No. 10/782,105  
Amendment dated December 1, 1005  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 1, 2005

claimed by the applicant. Therefore, it is submitted that the Klinger reference would not lead one to anticipate the combination of features as claimed by the applicant in claims 1, 7 and 8. Further, the interior bore of the Klinger device clearly does not have a uniform width from one end to the other end, as required in claims 1 and 7.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 1 and 3 through 11 is therefore respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date: DEC. 1, 2005

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)  
Customer No. 40,158  
P.O. Box 5027  
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027  
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357